



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/926,286	01/15/2002	Annamaria Colacci	100506-00004	1756

6449 7590 01/15/2004

ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.
1425 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

COOK, REBECCA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1614

DATE MAILED: 01/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/926,286

Applicant(s)

COLACCI ET AL.

Examiner

Rebecca Cook

Art Unit

1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. No support is seen in the specification in the "Disclosure of the Invention" for the phrase in claim 1 "reducing invasiveness and /or migration of malignant cells."

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the specific cancers disclosed on page 25, lines 2-3, does not reasonably provide enablement for any and all cancers. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

For rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, the following factors must be considered (In re Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404):

- 1) Nature of invention.
- 2) State of prior art.
- 3) Level of ordinary skill in the art.

4) Level of predictability in the art.

5) Amount of direction and guidance provided by the inventor.

6) Existence of working examples.

7) Breadth of claims.

8) Quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

See below:

1) Nature of the invention.

The claims are drawn to methods of reducing metastasis of malignant cells.

2) State of the prior art.

The references do not indicate which cancers may be treated by alpha lipoic acid or a physiological equivalent derivative thereof.

3) Level of ordinary skill in the art.

The level of ordinary skill in the art is high. Applicant's specification does not enable one to use the alpha lipoic acid or a physiological equivalent derivative thereof to treat all cancers.

4) Level of predictability in the art.

The art pertaining to the treatment of cancer is unpredictable. There is no one compound that is useful to treat all cancers. There would be little predictability in using alpha lipoic acid or a physiological equivalent derivative thereof to treat all cancers.

5) Amount of direction and guidance provided by the inventor.

Cancers encompass a broad variety of proliferative conditions that are treated with different compounds. It would require undue experimentation to determine which cancers and which compounds would yield physiological equivalents thereof.

6) Existence of working examples.

Applicant's limited working examples do not enable the public to use the compound of Formula I to treat any and all cancers. The specification provides data only for the using alpha lipoic acid with carcinogenic murine fibroblasts and human fibrosarcoma. There is no data using any physiological equivalent derivatives of alpha lipoic acid.

7) Breadth of claims.

The claims are extremely broad due to the vast number of possible cancers that may be treated and physiological equivalent derivatives of alpha lipoic acid that can be used.

8) Quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains to use the invention commensurate in scope with this claim. In particular, the specification fails to enable the skilled artisan to practice the invention without undue experimentation. It would require undue experimentation to determine which cancers and which compounds are physiological equivalent derivatives of alpha lipoic acid.

Based on the unpredictable nature of the invention and state of the prior art and the extreme breadth of the claims, one skilled in the art could not perform the claimed

Art Unit: 1614

process without undue experimentation, see *In re Armbruster* 185 USPQ 152 CCPA 1975.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 9 the nature of the adhesion of the malignant cells is not clear. Amending the claim to recite "adhesion to a basal membrane" of claim 10 and canceling claim 10 will overcome this rejection.

In claims 1, 9 and 11 the word "such" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the word are part of the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 99/06040 (Berry et al).

Berry et al (page 32, claim 1, page 30, lines 7-8) disclose using alpha lipoic acid or derivatives thereof orally or parenterally to treat cancer metastasis.

The instant claims differ over Berry in reciting that the active ingredient consists essentially of only an alpha lipoic acid or physiologically equivalent derivative thereof, whereas in Berry both a tocotrienol and alpha lipoic acid are used. However, Berry

Art Unit: 1614


discloses (page 13, lines 12-14) that each compound is effective and that the purpose of using them together is for synergistic effect. There is ample motivation to use the alpha lipoic acid alone, since Berry discloses that it is effective to treat cancer metastasis. For example, it could be used alone to measure baseline response to treatment or if the tocotrienol causes an adverse effect.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Cook whose telephone number is (703) 308-4724. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marianne Seidel, can be reached on (703) 308-4725. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4556.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.


REBECCA COOK
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1200/614

January 14, 2004